

### REMARKS


The Official Action of January 14, 2008 has been carefully considered. The amendments and remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto. The claims remaining in the case are 1-10. New claims 25 through 29 have been added to more precisely define the invention. Support for the new claims is found in the specification. Pursuant to the Restriction Requirement Claims 11 through 24 have been canceled without prejudice to refile.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC section 102 (b) as being anticipated by Pevarello et al and Koo et al. Claim 1 has been amended to delete compounds that overlap with the two references. Applicant's now believe they have addressed and overcome the Examiner's 102(b) rejection.

Claims 1-10 are objected to for containing non-elected subject matter. Applicant's respectfully traverse. As indicated in the Examiner's Restriction Requirement of November 19, 2007, upon election of a species the claims shall be restricted to said species if no generic claim is finally held allowable. Applicant's have amended the claims to address the Examiner's 102(b) rejection, which puts the elected invention in condition for allowance. Thus, since amended claim 1 is a generic claim in condition for allowance the claims should not be restricted to the species. Likewise, since new claims 26 through 29 fall within the scope of claim 1 they to should be allowed.

In light of the amendments and remarks herein Applicants believe the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number below if this would expedite the allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Sylvia A. Ayler  
Reg. No. 36436  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
MERCK & CO., INC.  
P.O. Box 2000  
Rahway, New Jersey 07065-0907  
(732) 594-4909

Date: January 23, 2008